

Table S1. Search strategy

Databases	Dates Searched	Search Terms 1	Search Terms 2	Search Terms 3	Search Terms 4	Search Terms 5	Search Terms 6	Search Terms 7	Search Terms 8	Search Terms 9	Limits
Ovid Medline; Ovid Embase; Ovid PsycINFO; SCI; Cochrane Central; BNI	2000-23 rd June 2015	Lesbian OR WSW OR “wome n who have sex with women ”	Queer OR homose xual* OR gay	1 OR 2	“Sexual history” OR “sexual habits” OR “sexual practice s”	Pregna n* OR matern * OR parent* OR abortio n OR “termin ation of pregna ncy”	Hospita l OR GP OR general practice OR primary care	Gynae* OR gyne* OR obstet*	4 OR 5 OR 6 OR 7	3 AND 8	LIMIT 2: Female (NB. This limit not possible on SCI, Cochrane, BNI)

Table S2. Unobtainable and excluded studies with reasons

Article	Unobtainable
Alvaraz P & Jurgenson J.. Experience and Meaning of Maternity in Lesbian and Heterosexual Women. <i>Archivos Hispanoamericanos de Sexologia</i> 2003;9(1):65-80.	Unobtainable. Attempted to contact author.
Jouannet P & Spira A. Demandes d'aide a la procreation formulees par les couples de meme sexe aupres de medecins en France. <i>Revue d'epidemiologie et de sante publique</i> 2014;62(4).	Website non-functioning. Unobtainable. Attempted to contact author. No relevant data based on abstract.
Article	Reason for Exclusion
Ahuja K. Egg-Sharing as a Fertility Treatment for Lesbians and as a Solution to Britain's Donor Egg Crisis. <i>Human Fertility</i> 2011;14(2):19.	Conference abstract
Amato P & Jacob M. Providing Fertility Services to Lesbian Couples: the Lesbian Baby Boom. <i>Sexuality, Reproduction and Menopause</i> 2004;2(2):83-87.	Review: no primary data
ASRM Pages. Access to Fertility Treatment by Gays, Lesbians, and Unmarried Persons: a Committee Opinion. <i>Fertility and Sterility</i> 2013;100(6):0015-0282	Review: no primary data
Auranicky J. The Impact of Partner Support on Postpartum Depression in Lesbian Mothers. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering</i> 2010;70(9-B): 5804	Dissertation
Averett P. et al. Older lesbians: experiences of aging, discrimination and resilience. <i>Journal of Women & Aging</i> 2011;23(3):216-32.	No comparison with heterosexuals
Backx C. et al. Intra-Uterine Insemination with Donor Semen in Non-Stimulated Cycles: a Large Retrospective Cohort Study. 18th World Congress on Controversies in Obstetrics, Gynecology & Infertility (COGI) 2014.	Data not divided into lesbian/heterosexual

Baetens P et al. Counselling Lesbian Couples: Requests for Donor Insemination on Social Grounds. Reproductive BioMedicine Online 2003;6(1):75-83	No comparison with heterosexuals
Ben-Ari A. & Livni T. Motherhood Is Not a Given Thing: Experiences and Constructed Meanings of Biological and Nonbiological Lesbian Mothers. Sex Roles 2006;54(7-8):521-531	No comparison with heterosexuals
Blanchfield B & Patterson C. Racial and Sexual Minority Women's Receipt of Medical Assistance to Become Pregnant. Health Psychology 2015;34(6).	No relevant data
Borneskog C. et al. Symptoms of Anxiety and Depression in Lesbian Couples Treated with Donated Sperm: a Descriptive Study. BJOG 2013;120(7): 839-846	No comparison with heterosexuals
Borneskog C, et al. How do lesbian couples compare with heterosexual in vitro fertilization and spontaneously pregnant couples when it comes to parenting stress? ACTA PAEDIATRICA 2014;103(5).	No relevant data
Bos H. et al.. Planned Lesbian Families: Their Desire and Motivation to Have Children. Human Reproduction 2003;18(10):2216-2224	No relevant data
Brewaeys A et al. Anonymous or Identity-Registered Sperm Donors? A Study of Dutch Recipients' Choices. Human Reproduction 2005;20(3):820-824.	No relevant data
Buber-Ennser I. Attrition in the Austrian Generations and Gender Survey: Is there a bias by fertility-relevant aspects? Demographic Research 2014; 31(16):459-496.	No relevant data
Buchholz S. Experiences of Lesbian Couples During Childbirth. Nursing Outlook 2000;48(6):307-311	Review: no primary data
Chabot J & Ames B. "It Wasn't 'Let's get Pregnant and Go Do It':" Decision Making in Lesbian Couples Planning Motherhood via Donor Insemination. Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies 2004;53(4):348-356	No comparison with heterosexuals
Chapman R. et al. The Experiences of Australian Lesbian Couples Becoming Parents: Deciding, Searching and Birthing. Journal of Clinical Nursing 2012;21(13-14):1878-1885	No comparison with heterosexuals
Charlton B. et al. Teen pregnancy risk factors among female adolescents of diverse sexual orientations. Reproductive Sciences. Conference: 62nd Annual Scientific Meeting of the Society for Gynecologic Investigation 2015.	Conference abstract
Chen C. et al. Sexual orientations of women with polycystic ovary syndrome: Clinical observation in Taiwan. Taiwan J Obstet Gynecol 2014;53(4):542-546.	No relevant data
Cheng S. & Powell B. Measurement, methods, and divergent patterns: Reassessing the effects of same-sex parents. Social Science Research, 2015;52.	No relevant data

Cochran S et al. Cancer-related risk indicators and preventative screening behaviours among lesbians and bisexual women. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i> 2001;91(4):591-597	Review
Crawshaw M. & Montuschi O..It 'did what it said on the tin' - Participant's views of the content and process of donor conception parenthood preparation workshops. <i>Hum Fertil (Camb)</i> 2014; 17(1);11-20	No relevant data
Cunningham D et al. Same-Sex Female Couples and Family-Building Through IVF: Patient and Treatment Dynamics. <i>Fertility and Sterility</i> 2011;1:S39.	No comparison with heterosexuals
Curry E. Lesbian Couples who Choose Motherhood: a Qualitative Study. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering</i> 2000;60(9-B):4882	Dissertation
Daar J..Accessing Reproductive Technologies: Invisible Barriers, Indelible Harms. <i>Berkeley J Gender. Law & Justice</i> 2008;23:18–82	Review: no primary data
deBrucker M et al. Cumulative delivery rates in different age groups after artificial insemination with donor sperm. <i>Human Reproduction</i> 2009;24(8):1891-9.	Data not divided by sexual orientation
deMino K et al. Lesbian Mothers with Planned Families: a Comparative Study of Internalized Homophobia and Social Support. <i>American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</i> 2007;77(1):165-173.	No comparison with heterosexuals
Dondorp WJ, de Wert GM, Janssens PMW. Shared lesbian motherhood: a challenge of established concepts and frameworks. <i>Human Reproduction</i> , February 2010: 25 (4); 812-814	No relevant data
Donovan C and Wilson A. Imagination and Integrity: Decision-Making Among Lesbian Couples to Use Medically Provided Donor Insemination. <i>Culture, Health and Sexuality</i> 2008;10(7): 649-665	No comparison with heterosexuals
Eisenberg BC. To Have or Not to Have; a Lesbian's Dilemma about Becoming a Mother. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: the Sciences and Engineering</i> 2003;64(1-B):416	Dissertation
Elliott M et al. Sexual Minorities in England Have Poorer Health and Worse Health Care Experiences: A National Survey. <i>J Gen Intern Med</i> 2015; 30(1):9-16	No relevant data
Giddings L. et al.. Birth cohort and the specialization gap between same-sex and different-sex couples. <i>Demography</i> 2014;51(2):509-34	No numerical results
Glover MP. Assisted Human Reproduction: Issues for Takatāpui (New Zealand Indigenous Non-Heterosexuals). <i>Journal of GLBT Family Studies</i> 2009; 5(4):295-311	Not numerical
Goldberg L et al. Queering the birthing space: Phenomenological Interpretations of the Relationships Between Lesbian Couples and Perinatal Nurses in the Context of Birthing Care. <i>Sexualities</i> 2011;14(2):173-192	Wrong comparison group (perinatal nurses)

Goldberg A. Intimate Relationship Challenges in Early Parenthood Among Lesbian, Gay, and Heterosexual Couples Adopting via the Child Welfare System. <i>Profesisonal Psychology – Research & Practice</i> 2014;45(4).	No relevant data
Goldberg A & Garcia R. Predictors of relationship dissolution in lesbian, gay, and heterosexual adoptive parents. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i> 2015; 29(3).	No relevant data
Goldberg A. & Scheib J. Female-partnered and single women's contact motivations and experiences with donor-linked families. <i>Human Reproduction</i> 2015; 30(6).	Qualitative data only
Gonzales G. & Blewett L. Disparities in Health Insurance Among Children With Same-Sex Parents. <i>Pediatrics</i> 2013; 132: 703-711.	No relevant data
Jiles J. Lesbian Mothers: Creating our Families. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences</i> 2000;60(7-A):2385	Dissertation
Holley S. Romeo, Romeo: A Look at a Winding Journey to Lesbian Parenthood. <i>Journal of Homosexuality</i> 2015;62(2).	No relevant data
Kaufmann T. Maternity Care for Lesbian Mothers; an Acid Test of Woman-Centred Care. <i>RCM Midwives Journal</i> 2000;3(4):116-117	No relevant data
Kerr D. et al. A Comparison of Lesbian, Bisexual, and Heterosexual Female College Undergraduate Students on Selected Reproductive Health Screenings and Sexual Behaviors. <i>Womens' Health Issues</i> 2013; 23(6).	No relevant data
Kleinert E. et al. Motives and Decisions for and Against Having Children Among Nonheterosexuals and the Impact of Experiences of Discrimination, Internalized Stigma, and Social Acceptance. <i>Journal of Sex Research</i> 2015; 52(2).	No comparison with heterosexuals
Konan Y. et al. [Description of sexual practices of women who have sex with other women to HIV / AIDS in Abidjan (Cote d'Ivoire)]. <i>Bull Soc Pathol Exot</i> 2014;107(5):369-375	No comparison with heterosexuals
Larsson A and Dykes A. Care During Pregnancy and Childbirth in Sweden: Perspectives of Lesbian Women. <i>Midwifery</i> 2009;25(6):682-690	No comparison with heterosexuals
Lee E. Lesbian Users of Maternity Services: Appropriate Care. <i>British Journal of Midwifery</i> 2004;12(6):353-358	Review: no primary data. Checked for included studies
Linara, E. et al. Lesbian, Single and Heterosexual Women: Outcome of 3534 Consecutive Cycles of Donor Insemination (DI). <i>Human Reproduction</i> 2011.26:i96	Pregnancy rates not given

Marina A. et al.. Sharing Motherhood: Biological Lesbian Co-Mothers, a New IVF Indication. Human Reproduction 2010; 25(4):938-941	No comparison with heterosexuals
Marshal M. et al (2013). Mental Health and Substance Use Disparities Among Urban Adolescent Lesbian and Bisexual Girls. J Am Psychiatr Nurses Assoc 2013; 19(5):271-27	No relevant data
Matthews A. et al. The relationships of sexual identity, hazardous drinking, and drinking expectancies with risky sexual behaviors in a community sample of lesbian and bisexual women. Journal of the American Psychiatric Nurses Association 2013; 19(5):259-70.	No comparison with heterosexuals
Mor Z. et al . Health Status, Behavior, and Care of Lesbian and Bisexual Women in Israel. Journal of Sexual Medicine 2015;12(5).	No relevant data
Peel, E. Pregnancy Loss in Lesbian and Bisexual Women: an Online Survey of Experiences. Human Reproduction 2010 25(3):721-727	No comparison with heterosexuals
Pontes M. et al. Familias Homoparentais e Maternidade Biologica. Psicologia & Sociedade 2015;;27(1).	Qualitative data only
Rasevic M. & Sedlecky K. Sexual and Reproductive Behaviour of Young Female Internet Users in Serbia. SRPSKI ARHIV ZA CELOKUPNO LEKARSTVO 2013;141(9).	No relevant data
Renaud, MT. We are Mothers Too: Childbearing Experiences of Lesbian Families. Journal of Obstetric, Gynaecologic and Neonatal Nursing 2007;36(2):190-199.	No comparison with heterosexuals
Robson, R. Lesbians and Abortion. Review of Law and Social Change 2011;35(1):247-279	Review: no primary data. Checked for included studies
Saewyc, E, Pettingell S, Skay, C. Teen pregnancy among sexual minority youth in population-based surveys of the 1990s: Countertrends in a population at risk. [Abstract]. Journal of Adolescent Health 2004;34:125–126	No figures given
Salo FT. The Fertile Imagination: Narratives of Reproduction. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry 2004;38(5):384-385	Book review
Sawyer N. et al. A survey of 1700 women who formed their families using donor spermatozoa. Reproductive Biomedicine Online 2013;27(4).	No relevant data
Scheib J, Riordan M, Shaver P. Choosing Between Anonymous and Identity Release Sperm Donors: Recipient and Donor Characteristics. Reprod Technol 2000;10:50–57	No comparison with heterosexuals
Scheib J. et al. Choosing identity-release sperm donors: the parents' perspective 13-18 years later.	No relevant data

Human Reproduction 2003; 18(5):1115-27.

Scott, K. Identifying Stressors and Coping Patterns During the Donor Insemination Process with Lesbian Couples: Implications for Health Care Providers. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences 2008;69(1-A):125

Siegenthaler, A. and Bigner, J. The Value of Children to Lesbian and Non-Lesbian Mothers. Journal of Homosexuality 2000;39(2):73-91

Steele, LS and Stratmann H. Counseling lesbian patients about getting pregnant. Canadian Family Physician 2006 52:605-611

Stewart, M. "We just want to be ordinary": Lesbian Parents Talk about their Birth Experiences. MIDIRS Midwifery Digest 2002. 12(3):415-418

Tarin J. et al. Deficiencies in reporting results of lesbians and gays after donor intrauterine insemination and assisted reproductive technology treatments: a review of the first emerging studies. Reproductive Biology and Endocrinology 2015.; 13(52).

Trettin S. et al. Lesbian Perinatal Depression and the Heterosexism That Affects Knowledge about this Minority Population. Archives of Women's Mental Health 2006 9(2): 67-73

Walcott G & Hickling F,. Correlates of psychosexual issues in the Jamaican population. The West Indian medical journal 2013. 62 (5):417-422,

Wall M. Reproductive Decision Making Among Lesbian Women. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences 2007; 68(3-A):1166

Wyverkens E Provoost V, Ravelingien A, de Sutter P, Pennings G, Buysse A. Beyond sperm cells: a qualitative study on constructed meanings of the sperm donor in lesbian families. Human Reproduction March 2014: 29 (6): 1248-1254

Wojnar D..Miscarriage Experiences of Lesbian Couples. Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health 2007;52(5):479-485

Yager C. et al. Challenges and Mental Health Experiences of Lesbian and Bisexual Women Who Are Trying to Conceive. Health & Social Work 2010;35(3):191-200.

No comparison with heterosexuals

No relevant data

Review: no primary data.
Checked for included studies

Thesis – no comparison with heterosexuals

Review: no primary data.
Checked for Included Studies

Review: no primary data.
Checked for included studies

No relevant data

Thesis – no comparison with heterosexuals

No comparison with heterosexuals

No comparison with heterosexuals

No comparison with heterosexuals

Table S3. Characteristics of the included studies

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
Agrawal <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ³²	Lesbian and heterosexual women undergoing ovarian stimulation with or without IUI treatment.	254 lesbian women undergoing ovarian stimulation with or without IUI treatment. Mean age 35.1 (SD 4.2). No bisexuals. Private sector assisted reproduction clinics (London Women's Clinic or Hallam Medical Centre). UK.	364 heterosexual women undergoing ovarian stimulation with or without IUI treatment. Mean age 35.6 (SD 4.7) NS.	Clinic sample. Women attending either clinic for treatment between November 2001 and January 2003. Data collected in the clinics – medical questionnaire, pelvic ultrasound scan, clinical examination, blood samples.	Pregnancy rates.	Cohort, prospective. No details of funding given other than support was provided by HCA Laboratories in London in the form of hormone profiling on women in the study.
Borneskog <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ⁴⁷ (and Borneskog <i>et al.</i> ,	Lesbian and heterosexual couples who are about to	166 lesbian couples about to receive donor insemination, participating in the Swedish	151 heterosexual couples about to undergo regular IVF treatment, participating in the Swedish	Clinic sample. Women starting treatment were asked if they would like to participate in the study. Questionnaires were	Previous biological children, adoptive children and stepchildren.	Cohort, prospective. Financial support from Merck Serono; -Uppsala/Örebro Regional Research Council; Medical Research Council of

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
2014) ⁴⁸	receive treatment for assisted conception.	Study on Gamete Donation, during the period 2005-2008. Mean age 32.14 (SD 3.98). No bisexuals. All seven fertility clinics. Sweden.	Study on Gamete Donation. Mean age 32.29 (SD 4.04).	handed out to all participants at the beginning of treatment.	Previous biological children in partners of women undergoing treatment. Birth of a child following successful assisted reproductive treatment.	Southeast Sweden.
Brandenburg <i>et al.</i> , 2007 ⁴⁹	Any lesbian or heterosexual women over the age of 18 years, in Chicago, Minneapolis St. Paul, or New York City.	550 lesbian women who participated in the Multi-Site Women's Health Study (MWHS) between 1994-1996. Bisexuals small sample size so not included in analysis. Mean age overall 43 (SD	279 heterosexual women who participated in the Multi-Site Women's Health Study (MWHS) between 1994-1996 Mean age overall 43 (SD 11).	Snowball sample. Questionnaires given to lesbian women in various formal and informal lesbian venues, for example book stores, posted flyers, discussion groups. Lesbian participants were asked to give a copy of the questionnaire to acquaintances presumed to be heterosexual, and with a similar work role. Original MWHS data	Previous children.	Cross-sectional survey, secondary analysis Lesbian Health Fund of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association; Mental Health Services Research Grant on Women and Gender from the National Institute on Mental Health; Internal Research Support Grant from the UIC College of Nursing; University of Illinois Department of Psychiatry;

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
		11). USA.		collection involved return of questionnaires either via mail (in a supplied pre-paid, SAE) or in person. Current study was a secondary analysis of this data.		Chicago survey – Chicago Board of Health, and Chicago Foundation for Women; NY survey – Professional Staff Congress of the City University of New York.
Brewster <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁵⁰	15,784 heterosexual and sexual-minority women who participated in the National Survey of Family Growth, in the 2002, or 2006-2010 cycle, between 20 and 40 years of age.	Lesbian and bisexual women over 20 years of age who participated in the National Survey of Family Growth in either the 2002 cycle, or 2000-2010 continuous cycle. Mean age (lesbian) 36.1 Mean age (bisexual) 30.6. USA.	Heterosexual women over 20 years of age who participated in the National Survey of Family Growth in either the 2002 cycle, or 2000-2010 continuous cycle. USA. Mean age 34.5	Nationally representative multistage area probability sample drawn from 110 strata across the United States, using a continuous interview method over 4 years. Responses collected through in-home, in-person interviews by trained female interviewers. Computer-assisted self-interviews used for sensitive questions.	Biological parent.	Repeated cross-sectional national survey. No details of funding given.
Bryn	US female	665 (0.76%)	86,418 (98.89%)	Nurse population sample.	Age of first	Cohort, prospective.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
Austin <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ⁵¹	registered nurses aged 25-58 years, living in 14 of the most populous US states.	lesbian nurses and 309 (0.35%) bisexual nurses participating in the baseline Nurses' Health Study II, 1989. New questionnaires then sent to cohort every 2 years – data up to 2005. Mean age at first birth (lesbian) 26.82 (bisexual) 26.78. 14 most populous states. USA.	heterosexual nurses participating in the baseline Nurses' Health Study II, 1989. New questionnaires then sent to cohort every 2 years – data up to 2005. Mean age at first birth 27.27	Baseline questionnaire sent to 520,000 registered nurses living in 14 of the most populous US states – returned completed questionnaire considered informed consent for participation. Data collected from returned questionnaires at baseline, and then 2-yearly.	birth, number of births.	Grants for work reported in this manuscript from American Cancer Society; NIH. Grants sent to laboratory since 1993: Alcoholic Beverage Medical Research Foundation, American Cancer Society, Amgen, California Prune Board, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Ellison Medical Foundation, Florida Citrus Growers, Glaucoma Medical Research Foundation, Hoffmann-LaRoche, Kellogg's, Lederle, Massachusetts Department of Public Health, Mission Pharmacal, National Dairy Council, Rhone Poulenc Rorer, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Roche, Sandoz, US Department of Defense, US Department of Agriculture, Wallace Genetics Fund, Wyeth-Ayerst, private contributions. SB Austin is supported by the Leadership

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
						Education in Adolescent Health project, Maternal and Child Health Bureau, HRSA grant T71-MC00009. D Bowen is supported by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention grant U48DP001922. "The costs of publication of this article were defrayed in part by the payment of page charges. This article must therefore be hereby marked advertisement in accordance with 18 U.S.C. Section 1734 solely to indicate this fact."
Case <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ⁵²	US women aged 32-51 years in 1995, who were registered nurses in 1989 (baseline NHSII), living in 14 of the most	694 lesbian nurses and 317 bisexual nurses participating in the Nurses' Health Study II, 1995 data. 14 most populous states. Weighted mean* age at first birth:	89,812 heterosexual nurses participating in the Nurses' Health Study II, 1995 data. Weighted mean* age at first birth:	Nurse population sample. Questionnaire sent to participants of the baseline NHSII questionnaire. Current study focuses on 1995 data.	Parity, age at first birth.	Cross-sectional survey. "Modest additional resources received" due to relation to NHSII: Alcoholic Beverage Medical Research Foundation; American Cancer Society; Amgen; California Prune Board; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; Ellison Medical Foundation; Florida Citrus Growers;

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	populous US states.	Lesbian – 42 Bisexual - 41 USA.	Heterosexual - 41			Glaucoma Medical Research Foundation; Glaxo-SmithKline; Hoffmann-LaRoche; Kellogg's; Lederle; Massachusetts Department of Public Health; Mission Pharmacal; National Dairy Council; Rhone Poulenc Rorer; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation; Roche; Sandoz; US Department of Defense; US Department of Agriculture; the Wallace Genetics Fund; Wyeth-Ayerst; and private contributions. Cohort, prospective.
Charlton <i>et al.</i> , 2013 ²⁸	81,974 women born between 1947-1964 who participated in the Nurses' Health Study II (NHSII), and 6,424 of their	NHSII: 612 lesbian women and 274 bisexual women from across the USA. GUTS: 74 lesbian teenagers, 891 mostly heterosexual/bisexual teenagers, and 91 'completely	NHSII: 79,593 heterosexual women from across the USA. GUTS: 5,368 heterosexual teenagers. All children of participants in NHSII. USA. No average ages given	NHSII – nurse population sample. Questionnaires mailed to participants. GUTS – consent given by NHSII participants for their children to be contacted, and questionnaires sent out to these children by post. Completed questionnaires returned by post.	Rates of teenage pregnancy.	Research grant from the National Institute of Health. Corliss & Austin supported by the Leadership Education in Adolescent Health Project grant from the Maternal and Child Health Bureau. Corliss also supported by grant from the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Charlton supported by the Training Program in Cancer Epidemiology.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	children, born between 1982 and 1987, who participated in the Growing Up Today Study (GUTS).	heterosexual but living with a same-sex partner'. All children of participants in NHSII. No average ages given. USA.				
Chetcuti <i>et al</i> , 2013 ³⁶	6039 women aged 18 to 69 living in France between October 2005 and March 2006, who reported having male or female sexual partners in	35 WSW (mean age 33.8, CI 29.7-37.9) and 39 WSWM (mean age 38.4, CI 34.1-42.7) aged 18 to 69 living in France between October 2005 and March 2006, who reported having male or female sexual partners in the past year.	5965 heterosexual women (mean age 41.9, CI 41.5-42.3) aged 18 to 69 living in France between October 2005 and March 2006, who reported having male or female sexual partners in the past year.	Data from the Contexte de la Sexualité en France (CSF) Survey; national population based survey, with the initial sampling frame being the telephone directory. Two-phase sampling used; first by selecting one adult per household, second by post-stratifying by age. Data collected via telephone interview – 20-40 minute questionnaire.	Number of children Induced abortion in previous 5 years	Cohort, retrospective. Funded by the French National Agency on AIDS research; the Ministry of Social Affairs; the Foundation of France; the National Institute for Health Education.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
De Sutter <i>et al.</i> , 2008 ⁵³	the past year. Women undergoing artificial insemination with donor spermatozoa (AID).	France. 120 lesbian women recruited between January 2002 and June 2006. Mean age 30.6 (range 18-44) No bisexuals. Infertility Centre, University Hospital Ghent. Belgium.	131 heterosexual women recruited between January 2002 and June 2006. Mean age 31.9 (range 22-45) Infertility Centre, University Hospital Ghent. Belgium	Clinic sample. Participants considered for inclusion when consulting for artificial insemination with donor spermatozoa (AID) between January 2002 and June 2006. Data collected retrospectively from patient files, and analysed until a first positive pregnancy test, or drop out.	Outcome of AID treatment: biochemical pregnancy, miscarriage, on-going pregnancy, extra-uterine pregnancy, drop-out, unknown outcome.	Cohort, retrospective. No details of funding other than 'no conflict of interest'.
Dibble <i>et al.</i> , 2002 ³⁵	Women aged 35 years or older attending the Lyon-Martin Women's Health Services (LMWHS) in San	433 lesbian women (mean age 41.8 SD 6.3) attending the LMWHS between 1995 and 1997 Urban health clinic for underserved sexual minority women with	586 heterosexual women (mean age 43.8 SD 7.1) attending the LMWHS between 1995 and 1997.	Clinic sample. LMWHS patients were included in the study if their chart included both an intake form and patient notes, and if they had specified either lesbian or heterosexual on the intake form. Audit tool created to collect data from patient charts, consisting of an	Ever pregnant, number of miscarriages, number of children, number of abortions.	Cohort retrospective. Breast Cancer Research Program; University of California Office of the President Center for Lesbian Health Research, UCSF.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	Francisco in 1995, 1996 or 1997.	special outreach to lesbians. No bisexuals. USA.		intake form and patient notes.		
Dibble <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ³⁷	English-speaking lesbian women living in California between 1999 and 2002, aged 40 or older.	324 lesbians aged 40 or older (mean age 49.7, SD 7.8) in California. No bisexuals. USA.	324 heterosexual sisters (mean age 48.9, SD 8.4, p =0.01) of participating lesbians.	Large, convenience snowball sample. Questionnaire packets handed out at 'venues where lesbians gather', eg musical venues, sporting events, pot lucks etc. Each lesbian woman who participated was asked to recruit her heterosexual sister, closest in age (not necessarily living in California). Mail-back, anonymous survey.	Ever pregnant, ever had an abortion, ever had a miscarriage.	Case-control. The California Breast Cancer Research Program Award.
Ferrara <i>et al.</i> , 2002 ⁵⁴ (and Ferrara <i>et al.</i> , 2000) ⁵⁵	Women undergoing intrauterine donor insemination with frozen spermatoz	49 lesbian couples (total of 192 cycles) undergoing intrauterine donor insemination between 1993	212 single women (total of 864 cycles), "generally not considered to have reduced fertility" undergoing intrauterine	Clinic sample. Patients were included in this retrospective study if they had attended the clinic between 1993 and 1997. Data collected from patient records to	Pregnancy rate per patient. Previous obstetric history (pregnancy	Cross-sectional survey. No details of funding given.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	oa.	and 1999 at the Bridge Centre, London. Mean age 35.0 (SD 5.1). No bisexuals. UK. (subset of 35 couples and 135 cycles between 1993 and 1997 reported in Ferrara 2000. Mean age 34.5 (range 26-44).	donor insemination between 1993 and 1999 at the Bridge Centre, London. Mean age 41.0 (SD 4.0). (subset of 122 single women and 536 cycles between 1993 and 1997 reported in Ferrara 2000. Mean age 38.5 (range 29-47) p<0.005.	identify treatment outcome, age, and diagnostic and treatment variables.	rates, live births, terminations, miscarriages, previous IUI-DI pregnancies, previous IUI-DI live births). Outcome of current treatment (pregnancy rate, miscarriage, termination, multiple pregnancy, ectopics) reported on subset.	
Fethers <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ³⁹	Women attending a public STI or HIV service from Sydney Sexual	1408 WSW (median age 27, range 14-78) attending a public, inner city HIV and STI centre March 1991-December	1423 WSM (median age 26, range 16-56) attending a public, inner city HIV and STI centre March 1991-December	Clinic sample. Data taken from standardised medical records of patients attending a public, inner city HIV and STI centre March 1991-December 1998.	Termination of pregnancy in past	Retrospective Cross-sectional No details of funding given.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	Health Centre between March 1991 and December 1998.	1998. Australia.	1998.			
Fiske and Weston 2014 ⁵⁶	Single women and lesbian women undergoing ART at Monash IVF clinic, between January 2009 and December 2012	Lesbian women attending the clinic for ART (number of women unspecified) – total cycles were 237 IVF and 90 AI. Mean age when first accessing ART 35.0 (SD 4.9). Australia.	Single women attending the clinic for ART (number of women unspecified) – total cycles were 729 IVF and 131 AI. Also, comparisons made with the general population – total cycles were 22,367 IVF and 758 AI. Mean age when first accessing ART 39.2 (SD 4.2) p<0.05.	Clinic sample. Data collected retrospectively from patient databases.	Pregnancy rate.	Retrospective cohort. No details of funding given.
Jennings <i>et al</i>	Lesbian	40 two-parent	49 two-parent	Recruitment in	Previous	Case-control

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
<i>al.</i> , 2014 ²⁶	and heterosexual couples who had previously adopted a child in the UK.	lesbian adoptive families with a child between the ages of 4 and 8 years, who had been living with them for at least 12 months. Mean ages of Parent A and Parent B (Parent A spending most time in childcare) 42.43 (SD 7.28) and 43.15 (SD 6.97) respectively. UK.	heterosexual adoptive families with a child between the ages of 4 and 8 years, who had been living with them for at least 12 months. UK. Mean age of woman 43.16 (SD 5.32).	collaboration with the British Association for Adoption and Fostering; local government and voluntary adoption agencies contacted those who had adopted through their agency, and local support groups also informed members of the study. Semi-structured interviews carried out in families' homes by a trainer interviewer.	biological child.	No details of funding given.
Kop <i>et al.</i> , 2015 ⁵⁷	Dutch women undergoing artificial insemination with donor sperm (AID) in	477 lesbian couples undergoing IUI (41.0% of a total 1163 women undergoing IUI) 216 lesbian couples undergoing ICI	295 heterosexual couples undergoing IUI (25.4% of 1163 women undergoing IUI) 273 single women undergoing IUI (23.5% of 1163	Clinic sample. Data taken retrospectively from sperm banks.	Ongoing pregnancy (fetal cardiac activity at TVU at a gestational age beyond 12 weeks).	Retrospective cohort study. No details of funding given.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	their natural cycle, between January 2009 and December 2010 at any of the 8 sperm banks in the Netherlands.	(31.8% of a total 680 women undergoing ICI) No bisexuals. Mean age of all women undergoing AID: IUI 34.0 (SD 4.3), ICI 33.8 (SD 4.5) The Netherlands.	women undergoing IUI). 249 heterosexual couples undergoing ICI (36.6% of 680 women undergoing ICI) 215 single women undergoing ICI (31.6% of 680 women undergoing ICI). Mean age of all women undergoing AID: IUI 34.0 SD 4.3, ICI 33.8 SD 4.5. Data taken from 8 sperm banks across the Netherlands.		Results expressed as a hazard ratio (HR).	
Lindley & Walseman n 2015 ²⁹	Sexually experienced New York	By sexual identity: 548 lesbian and	By sexual identity: 4202 heterosexual	Stratified, 2-stage probability sample of NYC students – opting out was	Ever pregnant.	Repeated cross-sectional survey.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	City high school students, Grades 9-12.	bisexual women (mean age 15.9). By sexual behaviour: 509 WSWM (mean age 15.9). USA.	women (mean age - 16.1). By sexual behaviour: 4383 WSM (mean age 16.0).	accepted. Repeated risk behaviour survey in New York City youth – self-completed questionnaire.		No details of funding given.
Mercer <i>et al.</i> , 2007 ³⁴	Any resident of Great Britain, aged 16 to 44 years, was eligible for inclusion.	31 WSEW residing in Great Britain, randomly selected. 147 WSWM. Age breakdown WSEW %: 16-24: 4.9 25-34: 51.0 35-44: 44.2. WSWM % 16-24: 42.4 25-34: 37.6 35-44: 20.0 UK.	5594 WSEM residing in Great Britain, randomly selected. UK. Age breakdown WSEM %: 16-24: 22.9 25-34: 39.6 35-44: 37.5	General population sample. Stratified probability sampling. 40,523 addresses selected from the small-user Postcode Address File. Interviewers visited all selected addresses and invited one member of each household at random to participate. Data collected via face-to-face interviews in participants' homes, and computer-assisted self interviews.	Previous natural children, induced abortion in past 5 years.	Cross-sectional survey. Supported by a grant from the United Kingdom Medical Research Council, with funds from the Department of Health, Scottish Executive, National Assembly for Wales.
Moegelin <i>et al.</i> , 2010 ³⁸	Women attending either a	204 WSW attending a WSW	177 women attending a gynaecology clinic	Clinic sample. All women attending the WSW clinic were included in the	Any pregnancy, number of	Cross-sectional survey. No details of funding given.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	gynaecology clinic for WSW specifically, or a regular gynaecology clinic between 1999 and 2002.	gynaecology clinic between 1999 and 2002 (including lesbian, bisexual, and 'other'). Mean age 35.6 (range 19-59). Sweden.	between 1999 and 2002. Mean age 35.9 (range 20-70)	study. Women attended the standard clinic were stratified according to age and what week they attended the clinic. Questionnaires were distributed either by hand or mail.	deliveries, number of induced abortions.	
Nordqvist <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁵⁸	Women undergoing artificial insemination with donor sperm across Sweden, 2005-2010, either via donor intrauterine insemination (d-IUI) or as embryo	171 lesbian women undergoing artificial insemination. Mean age 32 (SD 4) No bisexuals. Sweden.	124 heterosexual women undergoing artificial insemination. Sweden. Mean age 32 (SD 4), p=0.48	Clinic sample. Patients included if they met inclusion criteria. Data collected from patient records.	Previous total pregnancies; previous abortions; previous miscarriage; previous extra-uterine; numbers with children. Pregnancy rates as defined by positive pregnancy test following treatment	Retrospective cohort. The Stiftelsen Familjeplaneringafonden I, Uppsala; Swedish Research Council for Health, Working, Life, and Welfare; Marianne and Marcus Wallenberg Foundation. Open Access publication charges provided by Uppsala-Örebro Regional Research Council.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	transfers (ET) after IVF with donated sperm. All women living in stable relationships.				(expressed per woman and per treatment).	
Riskind <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ³⁰	6879.56 girls (weighted n) in Grades 8-12 who were participants of the 2005 and 2007 Youth Risk Behaviour Surveys (YRBS), who reported being	167 self-identified lesbian (mean age 16.27, 95% CI 16.07, 16.47), 994 self-identified bisexual (unweighted) (mean age 16.05, 95% CI 15.98, 16.12). 335 female partners only (mean age 16.04, 95% CI 15.90, 16.18),	9897 self-identified heterosexual (unweighted). Mean age 16.24 (95% CI 16.22, 16.26) 11131 male partners only (unweighted). Mean age 16.27 (95% CI 16.25, 16.29)	Participants attending schools in 1 of 13 jurisdictions (Boston, Chicago, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New York City, San Diego, San Francisco, Vermont, Wisconsin, Milwaukee. Data taken from 2005 and 2007 YRBS, initially collected via a survey.	Ever been pregnant.	Cross sectional study. No details of funding given other than supported in part by a dissertation fellowship awarded to RG Riskind by the University of Virginia Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	sexually experienced Unweighted total not given.	1103 both male and female partners (unweighted) (mean age 16.15, 95% CI 16.09, 16.22) Schools in 1 of 13 jurisdictions in the USA.				
Rothblum <i>et al.</i> , 2001 ⁵⁹	Any women in the US with exposure to selected publications, as listed in the 'Gayellow Pages'.	184 lesbian women across the USA who responded to, and completed a questionnaire, following an advertisement requesting volunteers. Average age 39.0. No bisexuals. USA.	184 heterosexual sisters of lesbian women, who had responded to, and completed a questionnaire, following an advert requesting volunteers for a study. Average age 38.0.	Snowball sample. Adverts posted in selected gay and lesbian publications across the US, asking for volunteers to participate in a survey. Volunteers were sent two copies of a questionnaire – one to complete themselves, and one to pass onto their sister. Questionnaires returned via a pre-paid, pre-addressed envelope, telephone, or email.	Numbers who consider themselves a 'homemaker' and who live with children.	Case-control. Supported by grants from the Lesbian Health Fund of the Gay and Lesbian Medical Association, and the Dean's Fund from the University of Vermont.
Saewyc <i>et al.</i> , 2008 ²⁷	Any children of high school	Schoolchildren identifying as lesbian in	Female schoolchildren identifying as	School sample. Cluster-stratified sample of classrooms of students,	Ever pregnant	Cross-sectional surveys. National Institute of Mental

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	age, eligible for random selection for survey.	Grades 7-12 in public schools across British Columbia (BC). Surveys taken in 1992, 1998 and 2003. Mean ages not specified. Lesbian: 1992: n=242 1998: n=444 2003: n=401 Bisexual: 1992: n=2,180 1998: n=2,812 2003: n=4,273 Canada.	'100%' heterosexual or bisexual in Grades 7-12 in public schools across British Columbia (BC), Canada. Surveys taken in 1992, 1998 and 2003. Mean ages not specified. 100% Heterosexual: 1992: n=110,685 1998: n=132,912 2003: n=115,645	some schools requiring parental consent. Data collection via a paper-and-pencil questionnaire, which was distributed by public health nurses and nursing students.		Health; National Institute of Drug Abuse, US; National Institute of Health; Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research BC; Institute for Gay and Lesbian Strategic Studies/ Williams Institute for Sexual Orientation and the Law, UCLA.
Salomon <i>et al.</i> , 2015 ³³	Women seeking treatment with donor semen, across all 9 public fertility centres in Denmark,	54 cohabiting lesbians. Mean age 32.5 (SD 4.8). Denmark.	73 heterosexual couples. Mean age 32.5 (SD 4.8). 184 single women (183 heterosexual women, and 1 lesbian woman – numbers refer to total single	Clinic sample Data collected via a questionnaire given on arrival at the clinic for first treatment – SAE included for return. Focus-group discussions and semi-structured qualitative interviews also held for single	Ever been pregnant.	Prospective cohort. Co-funded by grants from Ferring Pharmaceuticals; MSD Denmark ApS; Nordic Cryobank ApS; Juliane Marie Centre, Copenhagen University Hospital.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
Solomon <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ⁶⁰	from Feb 2012 to July 2013. Gay and lesbian men and women in Vermont who had either chosen to marry in a Civil Union or not.	212 lesbians married in a civil union in Vermont (mean age 42.74, SD 8.57), and 166 lesbians who had not married (mean age 42.15, SD 9.25). No bisexuals. USA.	women). Mean age 36.1 (SD 3.0). 219 heterosexual married women, who were siblings of those women married in a civil union (mean age 43.10, SD 1.52).	women. Civil union sample with snowballing for comparator. Married lesbians recruited first – requests for participants sent to all those who had undergone a civil union in Vermont from July 1 2000 to June 30 2001. Participants asked to include contact details of any married heterosexual siblings, and also any unmarried gay or lesbian couples within their friendship circles. Questionnaires mailed to participants, along with a pre-paid, pre-addressed return envelope.	Previous children.	Case-control. Grants from Gill Foundation, University Committee on Research and Scholarship of the University of Vermont.
Tornello <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ³¹	2664 women aged 15-20 years participatin	22 lesbian women and 131 bisexual women participating in the NSFG 2006-	1,235 heterosexual women participating in the NSFG 2006-	Computer-assisted, in-person interviews by trained female staff, in participants' homes.	Ever been pregnant; ever had an unwanted pregnancy;	Cross-sectional cohort. No details of funding given other than NSGF funded by various programs and

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
	g in the National Survey of Family Growth (NSFG) 2006-2010, in the USA.	2010. Mean ages of total sample: Lesbian 18.09 (SD 1.33) Bisexual 17.43 (SD 1.67). USA.	2010. Mean age of total sample: Heterosexual 17.53 (SD 1.68).		ever had a termination.	agencies of the US Department of Health and Human Services.
Valanis <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ⁶¹	Postmenopausal women aged 50-79 who participated in the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) Study, based at one of forty clinical centres across the US.	264 "lifetime" lesbians (mean age 59.4, SD 7.4), 309 "adult" lesbians (mean age 56.7, SD 5.6) and 740 bisexuals (mean age 59.7, SD 7.0) participating in the WHI study. USA.	90,578 heterosexual women participating in the WHI study (mean age 62.3, SD 7.4).	Snowball sample. Recruitment via adverts/unsolicited mailings. Potential participants contacted one of 40 clinical centres across the US, and underwent an initial screening via telephone. Following further eligibility testing, women were randomised into one of 3 trials. Those ineligible for any trial participated in an observational study. Data collected via a variety of questionnaires developed by a team of trial investigators and	Numbers of women who had never been pregnant.	Cross-sectional survey. No details of funding given.

Author, Year	Exposure	Population, Setting, Country	Comparison	Recruitment, data collection	Outcomes of interest	Study Design and Funding
Wiik <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁶²	Same-sex female couples who were joined in a registered partnership in Norway between August 1 st 1993 and 2011.	Same-sex female couples made up 48% of 3422 (calculated n = 1653) couples who were joined in a registered partnership between August 1 st 1993 and 2011. No bisexuals. Breakdown of ages %: <31: 26.7 31-35: 22.0 36-40: 21.0 >40: 30.3. Norway.	407,495 opposite-sex married couples in Norway, married between 1993 and 2011. Breakdown of ages %: <31: 22.4 31-35: 20.5 36-40: 21.7 >40: 35.4	staff. Data collected from Norwegian population data. Any couple married during this time was included.	Previous natural children, either from this relationship or a previous relationship.	Case control study. Supported financially by the Norwegian Ministry of Children, Equality and Inclusion.

Key: WSW women who have sex with women; WSM women who have sex with men; WSEW women who have sex exclusively with women; WSWM women who have sex with women and men; WSEM women who have sex exclusively with men. HCA Hospital Corporation of America; IUI intrauterine insemination; ICI intracervical insemination; ART assisted reproductive technology; IVF in vitro fertilization. * Calculated from categorical data

Table S4. Population samples: pregnancy outcomes

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results		
		Lesbian % (n/N) bisexual % (n/N)	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Statistics
Borneskog <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ⁴⁷	Previous biological children in partners of women undergoing treatment	Lesbian 16.3% (27/166)	No relevant comparator	
Brandenburg <i>et al.</i> , 2007 ⁴⁹	Ever gave birth previously	Lesbian 23% (147/550)*	Heterosexual 52% (156/279)*	p<0.001
Brewster <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁵⁰	Biological mother	Lesbian 13.4% (28/ 210)~ Bisexual 50.2% (298/ 593)~	Heterosexual 64.4% (9648/ 14981)~	p<0.0001
Bryn Austin <i>et al.</i> , 2012 ⁵¹	Mean number of births (age standardised)	Lesbian 0.38 Bisexual 0.98	Heterosexual 1.71	p<0.0001 p<0.0001
	Mean age at first birth	Lesbian 26.82 years Bisexual 26.78	Heterosexual 27.27 years	p=0.2808 p=0.225
Case <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ⁵²	Ever gave birth previously	Lesbian 23.5% (163/694) Bisexual 50.5% 157/317	Heterosexual 77.9% (69941/89812)	No relevant statistic given
	Age at first birth	Lesbian 14.0% (97/694) under 19 67.4% (468/694) aged 20-30 18.6% (129/694) over 30 Bisexual 13.2% (42/317) under 19 70.7% (224/317) aged 20-30 16.2% (51/316) over 30	Heterosexual 6.1% (5479/89812) under 19 79.1% (71041/89812) aged 20- 30 14.8% (13292/89812) over 30	No relevant statistic given

Charlton <i>et al.</i> , 2013 ²⁸	Pregnancy <20 years old	NHSII Lesbian 7.2% (44/612) Bisexual 20.4% (56/274)	NHSII Heterosexual 9.9% (7,882/79,593)	p=0.02 p<0.0001
				RR Lesbian 0.72 (95% CI: 0.54, 0.96) Bisexual 2.08 (95% CI: 1.64, 2.62)
	Pregnancy <20 years old	GUTS Lesbian 2.7% (2/74) Mostly heterosexual/bisexual 3.9% (35/891) Completely heterosexual, but living with same-sex partner 8.8% (8/91)	Completely heterosexual 1.8% (95/5,368)	p=0.64 p=0.001 p=0.02
				RR Lesbian 1.61 (95% CI 0.40, 6.55) RR Mostly heterosexual/ bisexual 2.28 (95% CI 1.53, 3.39) RR Completely heterosexual, but living with same-sex partner 5.82 (95% CI 2.89, 11.73)
Chetcuti <i>et al.</i> , 2013 ³⁶	Previous children	WSW 5.2% (2/35) WSWM 49.8% (19/39)	WSM 67.8% (4044/5965)	P=0.010
	Induced abortion in previous 5 years	WSW 0% (0/35) WSWM 5.7% (2/39)	WSM 4.2% (251/5965)	P=0.5

Dibble <i>et al.</i> , 2002 ³⁵	Ever pregnant	Lesbian 161/433 (37%)	Heterosexual 488/586 (83%)	p<0.05
	Mean number of miscarriages	0.25 0.95	0.44 1.42	All other values
	Mean number of abortions	0.87	Mean = 1.48	“significantly different”
	Mean number of children			
Dibble <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ³⁷	Ever pregnant	Lesbian 31.9% (103/323#)	Heterosexual sisters 86.1% (278/323#)	p<0.0001
	Ever had a miscarriage	6.8% (22/324)	20.7% (67/324)	p<0.0001
	Ever had an abortion	15.7% (51/324)	30.2% (98/324)	p<0.0001
	Mean number live births (SD)	0.32 (0.8) 0.08 (0.4)	1.8 (1.4)	p<0.0001 p=0.009
	Mean number miscarriages (SD)	0.2 (0.5)	0.28 (0.6)	p=0.003
	Mean number abortions (SD)		0.45 (0.8)	
	Termination of pregnancy in past	WSW 38% (537/1408)	WSM 27% 380/1423	P<0.001 OR 1.7 95% CI 1.4-2.0
Jennings <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ²⁶	Has a biological child (as couple)	Lesbian 10% (4/40)	Heterosexual 22% (11/49)	Not given
Lindley & Walseman n 2015 ²⁹	Ever pregnant	Lesbian or bisexual sexual identity 22.6% (124/ 548)~	Heterosexual sexual identity 13.3% (559/4202) ~	p<0.05
		WSW “n/a” WSWM 20.1% (102/509) ~	WSM 13.7% (601/4383)~	
Mercer <i>et al.</i> , 2007 ³⁴	Previous natural children	Exclusively WSW 9.9% (2/21)~ Bisexual 41.3% (49/118#)~	Heterosexual 63.2% (3046/4819)~	p<0.001
	Induced abortion in past 5 years	Exclusively WSW “n/a” Bisexual 18.8% (26/139#)~	6.0% (289/4819)~	“significantly different”

Moegelin <i>et al.</i> , 2010 ³⁸	Ever pregnant	WSW clinic attenders 22.7% (46/203#)	Gynaecology clinic attenders 75% (132/176#)	p<0.001
	Number of deliveries	10.8% (22/203#)	51.7% (91/176#)	p<0.001
	Number of induced abortions	10.3% (21/203#)	44.9% (79/176#)	p<0.001
Riskind <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ³⁰	Ever pregnant	Identify as lesbian 27% (45/167)~~	Identify as heterosexual 52% (5102/9897)~~	Sexual Identity: B:H p<0.002 H:L (NS) L:B (NS)
		Female-only partners NA	Male-only partners 58% (5510/9456)	Partner gender: Bisexually active: male only partners: p<0.001
		Identify as bisexual 19% (468/994)***		
		Bisexually active 20% (551/892)***		
Rothblum <i>et al.</i> , 2001 ⁵⁹	Living with children+	Lesbian 7.1% (13/184)	Heterosexual sisters 36.4% (67/184)	p<0.0005

Saewyc <i>et al.</i> , 2008 ²⁷	Ever pregnant	Given as n/ sexually experienced youth/ total 1992: 7.0% (17/98/242)~ 1998: 7.4% (33/228/444)~ 2003: 3.5% (14/110/401)~	"100% heterosexual" 1992: 3.1%% (3,387/33,206/110685)~ 1998: 1.8% (2,382/29,772/132912)~ 2003: 1.2% (1,361/25,673/115646)~	All p values for chi-square tests of trends <0.05 - <0.01
		Bisexual vs heterosexual 1992: 7.3% (160/597/2180)~ 1998: 10.9% (306/1499/2812)~ 2003: 4.9% (210/2380/4273)~		
	Ever pregnant AOR (CI)	1992: 2.38 (1.32,4.30) 1998: 2.37 (1.60,3.50) 2003: 2.63 (1.55,4.44)		
		Bisexual vs heterosexual 1992: 3.40 (2.81,4.11) 1998: 2.93 (2.56,3.36) 2003: 1.81 (1.55,2.10)		
Salomon <i>et al.</i> , 2015 ³³	Ever pregnant	Lesbian couples 20.4% (11/54)	Heterosexual couples: 28.8% (21/73) Single women: 30.1% (55/184)	No statistics
Solomon <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ⁶⁰	Has children	In civil union 34% (72/212) Not in civil union 31.3% (52/166)	Heterosexual married women 80.3% (176/219)	p<0.0005
	% who had children from a prior relationship	In civil union 19.3% (41/212) Not in civil union 18.1% (30/166)	15.1% (33/219)	NS

Tornello <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ³¹	Lifetime number of pregnancies	Lesbian 0.36 (SD 0.58) Bisexual 0.53 (SD 0.77)	0.46 (SD 0.82)	p=0.54 (f test)
		Lesbian 31.8% (7/15)	30.5% (377/1235)	p=0.20 (f test)
	Ever pregnant	Bisexual 38.2% (50/131)		
		Lesbian NR	6.4% (79/1235)	p=0.36 (f test)
	Ever had unwanted pregnancy	Bisexual 8.4% (11/131)		
		Lesbian NR	5% (62/1235)	p=0.002 (f test)
	Ever termination	Bisexual 12.2% (16/115)		
Valanis <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ⁶¹	Ever pregnant	"Lifetime lesbian" 35% (92/264) "Adult lesbian" 63% (195/309) Bisexual: 80.8% (598/740)	Heterosexual 92.4% (83694/90578)	No statistics
Wiik <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁶²	Couples with one or more children from current relationship	Lesbian 24.3% (401/1650)	72.3% (294619/407495)	No p values given
	Couples with one or more children from previous relationship	25.4% (419/1650)	35.6% (145068/407495)	

Key: *Numbers do not add up in original paper due to missing data as stated by authors; *** numbers and percentages given in paper do not correlate with each other; #number and/ or % as stated in original paper; ~ back calculations of n using weighted denominator; NR not reported; RR, relative risk; WSW, women who have sex with women; WSWM, women who have sex with women and men; WSM, women who have sex with men; UW unknown unweighted number. NHSII, Nurses' Health Study II; GUTS, Growing Up Today Study. +not specified whether biological or otherwise.

Table S5. Assisted reproduction (including artificial insemination samples): pregnancy outcomes

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
Agrawal <i>et al.</i> , 2004 ³²	Pregnancy rates (definition of 'pregnancy' not included by authors)	30.8% (78/254)	Mean age (SD) 35.1(4.2)	26.7% (97/364)	Mean age (SD) 35.6 (4.7)	No significant differences No significant differences in age
Borneskog <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁴⁸	Birth of a child	70.2% (28/40)*	Mean age (SD) 32.14 (3.98)	52.4% (17/33)*	Mean age (SD) 32.29 (4.04)	p=0.046 No statistics on age significance
De Sutter <i>et al.</i> , 2008 ⁵³	Miscarriage Biochemical pregnancy Extrauterine pregnancy Ongoing pregnancy	11.8% (14/120) 1% (1/120) 1% (1/120)	Mean age (range) 30.6 (18-44)	9.1% (12/131) 2.7% (4/131) 1% (1/131) 53.2% (70/131)	Mean age (range) 31.9 (22-45)	No significant differences "Prevalence of miscarriage and extrauterine pregnancy was similar to that of the general population." No statistics on age significance
Ferrara <i>et al.</i> , 2000 ⁵⁵	Clinical pregnancy rate (gestational sac on ultrasound 6-8weeks) Cumulative pregnancy rate after 8 cycles of treatment	57% (20/35) 70% (25/35) 15% (5/35)		35% (43/122) 47% (57/122) 35% (43/122)		p<0.05 p<0.05* p<0.05

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
	Miscarriage rate	0		6% (4/122)		
	Multiple pregnancy	0		1% (1/122)		
	Ectopic pregnancy	14% (20/139)		8% (43/536)		p<0.05*
	Overall pregnancy rate per cycle	cycles		cycles)		*When related to age, these results were not statistically significant
Ferrara <i>et al.</i> , 2002 ⁵⁴	Pregnancy rate per patient	53% (26/49)~	Mean age (range) 34.5 (26-44)	39% (83/212)~	Mean age (range) 38.5 (29-47)	p<0.005 for age of lesbian women vs single women
			Mean age (SD) 35.0 (5.1)		Mean age (SD) 41.0 (4.0)	p<0.005 for age
Fiske & Weston, 2014 ⁵⁶	Pregnancy rates per treatment cycle (mean percentage pregnancy rates and SD)	IVF: 34.40% (SD 10.19 AI: 12.64% SD 8.93		Single women: IVF: 21.84% SD 1.67 AI: 6.58% SD 5.02		Lesbian: single women using IVF: p<0.05
			Mean age (SD) when first accessing ART 35.0 (4.9)	General population: IVF: 29.55% SD 0.65 AI: 8.04% SD 1.27	Mean age (SD) when first accessing ART 39.2(4.2)	Lesbian: general population using AI: p<0.05 Age: p<0.05

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
Kop <i>et al.</i> , 2015 ⁵⁷	Ongoing pregnancy rate	HR: 1.0		Heterosexual couples: HR 1.2 Single women: HR 0.83		p=0.08 p=0.12
			Mean age (SD) of all women undergoing AID: IUI 34.0 (4.3) ICI 33.8 (4.5)		Mean age (SD) of all women undergoing AID: IUI 34.0 (4.3) ICI 33.8 (4.5)	
Nordqvist <i>et al.</i> , 2014 ⁵⁸		Natural cycle		Natural cycle		
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	DIUI		DIUI		NS
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	51.4% (54/105)		36.0% (18/50) 15.1% (18/119)		NS
	Live birth (live births/ women)	20.5% (54/263)		28.0% (14/50) 8.0% (4/50)		NS
	Miscarriage (miscarriage/women)	40.0% (42/105)				
		5.7% (6/105)		CC DIUI		NS
				31.4% (16/51)		NS
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)			15.0% (16/107)		NS
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	CC DIUI		27.5% (14/51)		NS
	Live birth	43.5% (20/46)		3.9% (2/51)		
		22.5%		FSH-DIUI		NS

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
	Miscarriage	20/89		21.4% (3/14)		NS
		32.6% (15/46)		13.6% (3/22)		NS
				21.4% (3/14)		NS
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	4.3% (2/46)		0% (0/14)		
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	FSH-DIUI 50% (2/4)		CC/FSH DIUI 29.2% (7/24)		NS
	Live birth	50% (2/4)		14% (7/50)		NS
	Miscarriage	50% (2/4)		29.2% (7/24)		NS
		0% (0/4)		0% (0/24)		
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	CC/FSH DIUI 48.3%		Total DIUI 44% (44/100)		p=0.046
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	(14/29) 17.1%		14.8% (44/298) 38% (38/100)		NS
	Live birth	(14/82)		6%(6/100)		NS
	Miscarriage	38.0% (11/29)		IVF		NS
		10.3% (3/29)		68.7% (57/83)		NS
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)			45.2% (57/126)		NS
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	Total DIUI 61.6% (90/146)		50.6% (42/83) 13.3% (11/83)		NS
	Live birth	20.5%		Frozen ET		NS
	Miscarriage	(90/438)		64.7% (33/51)		NS
		48.0%		31.7% (33/104)		NS

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	7.5% (11/146)		47.1% (24/51) 9.8% (5/51)		NS
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	IVF		Fresh/thawed ET		NS
	Live birth	47.8% (44/92)		108.4% (90/83)* 39.1% (90/230)		NS
	Miscarriage	34.6% (44/127)		79.6% (66/83)		NS
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	38.0% (35/92)	Mean age (SD) 32 (4)	19.3% (16/83)	Mean age (SD) 32(4)	P=0.48 for age
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	8.7% (8/92)				
	Live birth	Frozen ET				
	Miscarriage	63.3% (31/49)				
	Pregnant (positive pregnancy test/ woman)	31.6% (31/98)				
	(positive pregnancy test/ treatment)	49.0% (24/49)				
	Live birth	10.2% (5/49)				
	Miscarriage	Fresh/thawed ET				
		81.6% (75/92)				

Author, Year	Outcome measure	Quantitative results				
		Lesbian % (n/N)	Age	Comparison Group % (n/N)	Age	Comparative statistics
		33.3% (75/225)				
		64.1% (59/92)				
		14.1% (13/92)				

Key: ^ read from graphs; *n and/or % as stated in the paper, ~ back calculations of n; AI, artificial insemination; AID, artificial insemination by donor; CC, clomiphene citrate; DIUI donor intrauterine insemination; ET, embryo transfer; FSH, follicular stimulating hormone; HR, hazard ratio; ICI, intracervical insemination; IUI, intrauterine insemination; IVF, in vitro fertilisation